DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 152 SP 027 128

AUTHOR Stolworthy, Reed L.
TITLE Evaluation of Master of Education Graduate Degree Programs.
PUB DATE 3 Jan 86
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; Educational Administration; *Graduate Study; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Washburn University of Topeka KS

ABSTRACT

A follow-up study determined the adequacy of preparation provided by Washburn University's (Kansas) graduate programs as perceived by graduates of the programs. A total of 34 graduates from the summer of 1984 through the summer of 1985 answered questionnaires on their opinions about graduate programs in Administration, Curriculum and Instruction, and Reading. Questionnaire items related to graduates' perceptions of: (1) adequacy of preparation relative to the Kansas State Department of Education objectives; (2) the overall quality of the graduate program; (3) rationale for selecting particular graduate programs; and (4) problems experienced during the process of completing the graduate program. Results are presented in 20 tables and discussed. In general, graduates from the reading degree program rated it as very or exceedingly adequate, while most graduates of the curriculum and instruction program rated it as adequate. The majority of graduates from the administration program rated it as adequate or very adequate. Weaknesses and problems within each program are identified. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

ED265152

EVALUATION OF MASTER OF EDUCATION GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

SUBMITTED BY

DR. REED L. STOLWORTHY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66621

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Stolworthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 027 128

JANUARY 3, 1986

EVALUATION OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS
1984-85

Introduction

This follow-up study of the three graduate degree programs of Administration, Curriculum and Instruction, and Reading included the total number of graduates at Washburn University from the Summer of 1984 through the Summer of 1985. Since the two new graduate degree programs in Special Education, Learning Disabilities and Emotionally Disturbed were still in their beginning stage with a combined total of 3 graduates, these new programs were not included in this particular study but will be surveyed as soon as a larger population is available to include in a study. The total number of graduates from the above programs were 51, with 34 in Administration, 10 in Curriculum and Instruction, and 7 in Reading.

All graduates were asked by letter to respond to the anonymous questionnaire. Thirty-four questionnaires were returned out of a possible number of 51, thus establishing a 67 percent rate of response.

Date were received from the graduates relative to the adequacy and quality of their preparation as viewed from them perception as professionals on the job. Information

was also received concerning the primary reasons for selecting their graduate degree program and problems, if any, encountered while pursuing the particular graduate degree plan.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the adequacy of preparation provided by Washburn University's graduate degree programs as perceived by the graduates of each respective program. The study included the graduates from the Summer of 1984 through the Summer of 1985.

Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. How adequate was the preparation received through Washburn University's graduate degree plans relative to Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) objectives applicable to various programs?
2. What were the graduate students' perceptions relative to the overall quality of the graduate preparation received at Washburn University?
3. What rationale did graduate students express regarding their selection of a particular graduate level program?
4. What, if any, problem did Washburn University graduate students experience during the process of completing the respective graduate degree program?

Research Design

Lists of graduates completing their respective Master's Degree were obtained from the official Registrar's copy. Included on the Registrar's copy were addresses for reaching each of the former students. In order to help insure that the mailing address was current for each graduate, the Alumni's record of names and addresses of recent graduates was utilized for checking the accuracy of each address. Thus, 51 graduates were identified for inclusion in the study. Thirty-four had received their graduate degree in Administration, 10 in Curriculum and Instruction, and 7 in Reading. The above list included graduates from the Summer of 1984 through the Summer of 1985.

All graduates were asked by letter to respond to the anonymous questionnaire designed to secure data regarding the primary reasons for selecting their graduate degree program, the major problems encountered while pursuing the graduate degree, and the adequacy and quality of their preparation as viewed from their perception as professionals on the job. Fifty-one graduates were located and had the opportunity to respond. Thirty-four of the 51 graduates responded to the questionnaire, thus establishing a 67 percent rate of response.

Since the two new graduate degree programs, Special Education: Learning Disabilities and Special Education:

Emotional Disturbance were in their beginning stage with only a combined total of 3 graduates, a new study will be forthcoming as soon as a larger population is available for inclusion in a study.

Reading Degree Program

Table I shows that 100 percent of the respondents in the Reading degree program viewed their preparation as adequate in developing an understanding of the nature of the reading process, the issues and trends in reading education, the relationship of reading skills to various academic disciplines and in effective comprehension strategies. In addition, Table I illustrates that 100 percent of the respondents also perceived their preparation as adequate in developing skills in the effective teaching of reading, the measurement and evaluation methods, and in the planning of reading programs. Eighty-three percent of the respondents noted that they had received adequate preparation in developing skills in the remediation of reading problems and in the planning of reading programs. Sixty-seven percent indicated adequate preparation in developing skills in the diagnosis of reading problems. Some concern was expressed relative to the need for additional current updated testing and diagnostic materials to supplement the excellent instructors.

Table II presents data relative to the responses of the Reading degree M.Ed. graduates of 1984-85 concerning the strengths of the program. Eighty-three percent of the respondents specified that the quality of instruction and the student-faculty relationships were strengths in the Reading degree program, and 67 percent acknowledged the provisions for advisement as a definite strength. In addition, 17 percent indicated that the practicum experiences, theoretical foundations, and the acquaintance with the various roles of school personnel were definite strengths. Table II also shows 83 percent of the respondents citing the practicum experiences and the acquaintance with the various roles of school personnel as adequate, and theoretical foundations was viewed as acceptable by 50 percent of the respondents. Since quality of instruction had been viewed by 83 percent of the respondents as a strength, 17 percent perceived the instruction as acceptable. Likewise, 17 percent noted the provisions for advisement and the acquaintance with the various roles of school personnel as acceptable. The only weaknesses perceived in the Reading degree plan were theoretical foundations (33 percent) and provisions for advisement as indicated by 17 percent of the respondents.

Table III summarizes the responses relative to the overall quality of the Reading degree program by the 1984-85

graduates. Thirty-three percent perceived the overall quality as exceedingly adequate. The remaining 67 percent rated the Reading degree program as very adequate. Therefore, there were no ratings of adequate, inadequate, or very inadequate.

Curriculum and Instruction Degree Program

Table IV illustrates the responses of the graduates from the Curriculum and Instruction degree plan relative to their perceptions concerning the adequacy of preparation. One hundred percent of the respondents indicated that their preparation was adequate in developing an understanding concerning the instructional elements of the curricular programs. In addition, 80 percent viewed their preparation in developing an understanding concerning an overview of the school curriculum and the educational changes in school curriculum as adequate. Seventy-five percent perceived their preparation adequate concerning the administration and supervision of educational programs, and 60 percent indicated that their understanding was adequate relative to the administration and supervision of educational programs. Table IV also shows that 100 percent indicated that their preparation had been adequate relative to developing skills in instructional evaluation and in analyzing the issues related to American education. Adequacy of Preparation in

developing skills in curricular innovations and in research techniques was rated 80 percent and 60 percent, respectively.

Table V depicts the 1984-85 graduate' ratings of the strengths associated with the Curriculum and Instruction degree plan. Student-faculty relationships was viewed as a strength by 40 percent, and acceptable by 40 percent. In addition, theoretical foundations was considered as a strength by 25 percent of the respondents, and the quality of instruction and the provisions for advisement were also perceived as strengths by 20 percent of the respondents. Table V also illustrates the graduates' ratings relative to the program being acceptable. One hundred percent indicated that their preparation was adequate regarding the acquaintance with the various roles of school personnel. Eighty percent viewed the quality of instruction as adequate, and 60 percent perceived the provisions for advisement and the cognate courses in related academic disciplines offered outside the Department of Education as acceptable. Theoretical foundations, student-faculty relationships, and the thesis requirement received the rating of 50 percent, 40 percent, and 25 percent, respectively. In addition, Table V presents the specific weaknesses cited by the 5 respondents. Seventy-five percent believed the thesis requirement to be a weakness. Theoretical foundations was indicated a weakness by 25

percent. Student-faculty relationships and cognate courses in related academic disciplines offered outside the Department of Education were identified as a weakness by 20 percent.

Table VI summarizes the overall quality of the degree plan in Curriculum and Instruction according to the five specific levels representing the degree of quality. It can readily be noticed that 60 percent rated the degree plan as adequate. The ratings of very adequate and inadequate each received a rating by 20 percent of the 5 respondents. No ratings of exceedingly adequate or very inadequate were received.

Educational Administration Degree Plan

Table VII presents the responses received from the largest population involved in the follow-up study. Ninety-six percent of the 23 respondents indicated that their preparation was adequate in the development of an understanding relative to administrative responsibilities in the areas of organization, supervision, and management. In addition, 92 percent of the responses rated the degree plan as adequate in regards to developing an understanding concerning programs for developing positive relations between the school and community. Further, successful techniques for effective decision making and school law were

each rated adequate by 87 percent of the respondents. Table VII also shows that 87 percent of the respondents perceived their preparation adequate in developing skills in effective business practices in school administration and in making decisions concerning school finance. In addition, 83 percent of the responses were awarded to adequate skill development relative to improving instruction and in dealing with personnel problems, and 79 percent was attributed to the development of skills in research techniques.

Table VIII shows the ratings of strength as perceived by the 23 respondents. Student-faculty relationships and the acquaintance with the various roles of school personnel were viewed as strengths by 70 percent and 43 percent, respectively. Provisions for advisement was rated as a strength by 39 percent, and quality of instruction by 26 percent. Theoretical foundations and the thesis requirement were also each viewed as a strength by 22 percent and 18 percent of the respondents. Table VIII also presents data relative to the percentage of respondents that considered the degree plan in educational administration as acceptable. It can readily be noticed that the highest ratings were awarded to the thesis requirement (76 percent), theoretical foundations (70 percent), and quality of instruction (61 percent). Provisions for advisement and the acquaintance with the various roles of school personnel were each awarded the rating of adequacy by 48 percent of the respondents. In

addition, Table VIII shows the specific weaknesses cited by the 23 respondents. Quality of instruction and provisions for advisement were noted by 13 percent of the respondents. Nine percent cited a weakness relative to theoretical foundations and also in regards to the acquaintance with the various roles of school personnel. Six percent believed the thesis requirement to be a weakness. None of the respondents felt that student-faculty relationships was a weakness in the degree plan of educational administration.

Table IX presents data regarding the overall quality of the educational administration degree plan as viewed by the 23 respondents. The largest proportion of the sample viewed the degree plan as very adequate (61 percent) and 30 percent evaluated the program as adequate. In addition, 9 percent of the respondents indicated that the overall quality of the educational administration degree plan was exceedingly adequate.

Primary Reason for Selecting Graduate Program

Table X illustrates the primary reason for the graduates of 1984-85 for selecting a graduate degree program. It can readily be noticed that relevance to present (or future) occupational needs was the major reason indicted by most of the graduates of the three graduate programs. Next in frequency of occurrence was the geographic assess to Washburn University which was followed

by the cost factors and interest to study with a specific professor.

Graduates' Identification of Problems in Program Completion During 1984-85

Table XI shows some of the major and minor problems encountered by the graduates in each respective degree program. This table depicts the responses obtained relative to the deliberate attempt to get M.Ed. graduates of 1984-85 to identify a few problems encountered in completing their degree. It was assumed that most people usually encounter a few problems and each respondent was encouraged to mention the problem(s) that was most significant and the problem which was second-most significant.

Tables of Comparisons Between the 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 Graduate Degree Plan Ratings

Each of the following tables shows the number of responses received, and the derived Mean values relative to the same criteria under consideration for each respective follow-up study conducted from 1981 through 1985.

Table XII presents a comparison of Washburn University M.Ed. graduates' ratings of program acceptability as presented by the graduates of 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 concerning the Reading degree plan.

Table XIII shows a comparison of Washburn University M.Ed. graduates' ratings of program strengths,

acceptability, and weaknesses as indicated by the graduates of 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 concerning the Reading degree plan.

Table XIV presents a comparison of the Washburn University M.Ed. graduates' ratings of the overall quality of the graduate degree plan in Reading as perceived by the graduates of 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85.

Table XV illustrates a comparison of the Washburn University M.Ed. graduates' ratings of program acceptability as judged by the graduates of 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 concerning the Curriculum and Instruction degree plan.

Table XVI presents a comparison of the Washburn University M.Ed. graduates' ratings of program strengths, acceptability, and weaknesses as viewed by the graduates of 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 relative to the Curriculum and Instruction degree plan.

Table XVII shows the comparison of the 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 Washburn University M.Ed. graduates' ratings of the overall quality of the graduate preparation received through the Curriculum and Instruction degree plan.

Table XVIII depicts the comparison of Washburn University M.Ed. graduates' ratings of program strengths, acceptability and weaknesses as judged by the graduates of 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 relative to the degree plan in Educational Administration.

Table XIX is a comparison of Washburn University M.Ed. graduates' ratings of the overall quality of the graduate preparation as viewed by the graduates of 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 in the degree plan of Educational Administration.

Table XX illustrates the comparison of Washburn University M.Ed. graduates ratings of the overall quality of the graduate preparation as viewed by the graduates of 1981-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 in the degree plan of Educational Administration.

TABLE I

GRADUATES' RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF PREPARATION
READING DEGREE PROGRAM
1984-85

N - 6

	N-6	%
Adequacy of Preparation in Developing an Understanding of:		
-The Nature of the Reading Process	6	100
-The Issues and Trends in Reading Education	6	100
-The Relationship of Reading Skills to Various Academic Disciplines	6	100
-Effective Comprehension Strategies	6	100
Adequacy of Preparation in Developing Skills in:		
-The Effective Teaching of Reading	6	100
-The Diagnosis of Reading Problems	6	67
-The Remediation of Reading Problems	6	83
-Measurement and Evaluation Methods	6	100
-The Planning of Reading Programs	6	100
-Research Techniques	6	83

% = rounded to nearest hundred

N = Number of responses included only those who answered each question.

TABLE II

GRADUATES' RATING OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS
READING DEGREE PROGRAM
1984-85

N - 6

Strength of Program	N-6	%
-Quality of Instruction	6	83
-Provisions for Advisement	6	67
-Practicum Experiences	6	17
-Student-Faculty Relationships	6	83
-Theoretical Foundations	6	17
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	6	17
Acceptable as a Reading Degree Program		
-Quality of Instruction	6	17
-Provisions for Advisement	6	17
-Practicum Experiences	6	83
-Student-Faculty Relationships	6	17
-Theoretical Foundations	6	50
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	6	83
Weaknesses of the Program		
-Quality of Instruction	6	0
-Provisions for Advisement	6	17
-Practicum Experiences	6	0
-Student-Faculty Relationships	6	0
-Theoretical Foundations	6	33
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	6	0

TABLE III

OVERALL QUALITY OF THE READING DEGREE PROGRAM
1984-85

N - 6

	N-6	%
-Exceedingly Adequate	6	33
-Very Adequate	6	67
-Adequate	6	00
-Inadequate	6	00
-Very Inadequate	6	00

TABLE IV

GRADUATES' RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF PREPARATION
CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION DEGREE PLAN
1984-85

N - 5

	N-5	%
Adequacy of Preparation in Developing an Understanding Concerning:		
-An Overview of the School Curriculum	5	80
-The Patterns of School Organization	5	60
-Instructional Elements of the Curricular Programs	5	100
-Educational Changes in School Curriculum	5	80
-The Administration and Supervision of Educational Programs	5	75
Adequacy of Preparation in Developing Skills in:		
-Curricular Innovations	5	80
-Instructional Evaluation	5	100
-Analyzing Issues Related to American Education	5	100
-Research Techniques	5	60

TABLE V

GRADUATES' RATINGS OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS IN CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION DEGREE PLAN
1984-85

N - 5

Strength of Program	N-5	%
-Quality of Instruction	5	20
-Provisions for Advisement	5	20
-Thesis Requirement	4	00
-Student-Faculty Relationships	5	40
-Theoretical Foundations	4	25
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	5	00
-Cognate Courses in Related Academic Disciplines Offered Outside the Department of Education	5	20
Acceptable as a Curriculum and Instruction Degree Plan		
-Quality of Instruction	5	80
-Provisions for Advisement	5	60
-Thesis Requirement	4	25
-Student-Faculty Relationships	5	40
-Theoretical Foundations	4	50
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	5	100
-Cognate Courses in Related Academic Disciplines Offered Outside the Department of Education	5	60

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

	N-5	%
Weaknesses of the Program		
-Quality of Instruction	5	0
-Provisions for Advisement	5	20
-Thesis Requirement	4	75
-Student-Faculty Relationships	5	20
-Theoretical Foundations	4	25
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	5	0
-Cognate Courses in Related Academic Disciplines Offered Outside the Department of Education	5	20

% = rounded to the nearest hundred

N = Number of responses included only those who answered each question. One left blank: therefore, total will not be 5

TABLE VI

OVERALL QUALITY OF THE CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
DEGREE PLAN
1984-85

N - 5

	N-5	%
-Exceedingly Adequate	5	0
-Very Adequate	5	20
-Adequate	5	60
-Inadequate	5	20
-Very Inadequate	5	0

TABLE VII
GRADUATES' RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF PREPARATION
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEGREE PLAN
1984-85

N -23

	N-23	%
Adequacy of Preparation in Developing an Understanding of:		
-Administrative Responsibilities in the Areas of Organization, Supervision, and Management	23	96
-Successful Techniques for Effective Decision Making	23	87
-School Law	23	87
-Programs for Developing Positive Relations Between School and Community	23	92
Adequacy of Preparation in Developing Skills in:		
-Improving Instruction	23	83
-Dealing with Personnel Problems	23	83
-Effective Business Practices in School Administration	23	87
-Decision Making Concerning School Finance	23	87
-Research Techniques	23	79

TABLE VIII

GRADUATES' RATINGS OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEGREE PLAN
1984-85

N - 23

Strength of Program	N-23	%
-Quality of Instruction	23	26
-Provisions for Advisement	23	39
-Thesis Requirement	17	18
-Student-Faculty Relationships	23	70
-Theoretical Foundations	23	22
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	23	43
Acceptable as a Educational Administration Degree Plan		
-Quality of Instruction	23	61
-Provisions for Advisement	23	48
-Thesis Requirement	17	76
-Student-Faculty Relationships	23	30
-Theoretical Foundations	23	70
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	23	48
Weaknesses of the Program		
-Quality of Instruction	23	13
-Provisions for Advisement	23	13
-Thesis Requirement	17	6
-Student-Faculty Relationships	23	0
-Theoretical Foundations	23	9
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	23	9

TABLE IX

OVERALL QUALITY OF THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEGREE PLAN
1984-85

N - 23

	N-23	%
-Exceedingly Adequate	23	9
-Very Adequate	23	61
-Adequate	23	30
-Inadequate	23	0
-Very Inadequate	23	0

TABLE X

PRIMARY REASON FOR SELECTING GRADUATE PROGRAM
1984-85

N - 34

Reason	Reading N-6	Curr. & Inst. N-5	Ed. Adm. N-23
-Relevance to Present (or future) Occupational Needs	5	2	18
-Interest in Study with a Specific Professor	1	0	0
-Geographic Access to Washburn University	2	3	6
-Cost Factors	1	0	1

Number of responses includes only those who answered each question. Some left blanks; totals will not always be 6, 5, 23 respectively. In addition, some individuals had more than one primary reason for selecting a graduate program.

TABLE XI

GRADUATES' IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS IN PROGRAM COMPLETION
1984-85

Problems	N-6 Reading Most	N-6 Reading Second	N-5 Curr. & Inst. Most	N-5 Curr. & Inst. Second	N-23 Ed. Adm. Most	N-23 Ed. Adm. Second
-Difficulty of Degree Program (e.g., courses, exames,etc. thesis, etc.)	1	0	1	0	0	3
-Poor Scheduling of Needed Classes	2	1	0	0	6	1
-Finding Sufficient Funds to Support Graduate Study (e.g.,job,loans, etc.)	2	2	0	2	2	5
-Administrative Requirements (e. filing required forms, getting waivers and exceptions approved, etc.)	1	3	2	2	5	7

TABLE XII

A COMPARISON OF W..U M.ED. GRADUATES' RATINGS OF PROGRAM ACCEPTABILITY BY GRADUATES OF 1981-83, 1983-84, AND 1984-85 CONCERNING THE READING DEGREE PLAN

Adequacy of Preparation in Developing An Understanding Concerning:	1981-83 N	1981-83 Mean	1983-84 N	1983-84 Mean	1984-85 N	1984-85 Mean
-The Nature of the Reading Process	12	3.33	5	4.40	6	4.50
-The Issues and Trends in Reading	12	3.42	5	4.20	6	4.17
-The Relationship of Reading Skills to Various Academic Disciplines	12	3.42	5	4.00	6	3.83
-Effective Comprehension Skills	12	3.42	5	3.80	6	4.00
Adequacy of Preparation in Developing Skills in:						
-The Effective Teaching of Reading	13	2.85	5	3.60	6	4.33
-The Diagnosis of Reading Problems	13	3.69	5	4.40	6	3.83
-The Remediation of Reading Problems	13	3.23	5	4.00	6	4.00
-Measurement and Evaluation Methods	13	3.08	5	3.80	6	3.67
-The Planning of Reading Programs	13	2.85	5	3.60	6	3.67
-Research Techniques	13	3.08	5	4.00	6	3.17

5.00 = Exceedingly Adequate
4.00 = Very Adequate
3.00 = Adequate
2.00 = Inadequate
1.00 = Very Inadequate

TABLE XIII

A COMPARISON OF W.U. M.ED. GRADUATES' RATINGS OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS, ACCEPTABILITY, AND WEAKNESSES BY GRADUATES OF 1981-83, 1983-84, AND 1984-85 CONCERNING THE READING DEGREE PLAN

Degree of Strength, Acceptability, and Weaknesses in:	1981-83 N	1981-83 Mean	1983-84 N	1983-84 Mean	1984-85 N	1984-85 Mean
-Quality of Instruction	13	3.92	5	4.80	6	4.83
-Provisions for Advisement	13	4.08	5	3.40	6	4.50
-Practicum Experiences	13	4.08	5	4.20	6	4.17
-Student- Faculty Relationships	13	4.38	5	4.60	6	4.83
-Theoretical Foundations	13	4.00	5	4.00	6	3.83
-Acquaintance with the Roles of School Personnel	13	3.69	5	4.00	6	4.17

Scale:

5.00 = Strength
4.00 = Acceptable
3.00 = Weakness

TABLE XIV

A COMPARISON OF W.U. M.ED. GRADUATES' RATINGS OF THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE PLAN IN READING BY THE GRADUATES OF 1981-83, 1983-84, AND 1984-85

	1981-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Overall Quality of the Graduate Preparation Received at W.U.	12	3.00	5	3.80	6	4.33

Scale:

5.00 = Exceedingly Adequate
4.00 = Very Adequate
3.00 = Adequate
2.00 = Inadequate
1.00 = Very Inadequate

TABLE XV

A COMPARISON OF W.U. M.ED. GRADUATES' RATINGS OF PROGRAM ACCEPTABILITY BY GRADUATES OF 1981-83, 1983-84, AND 1984-85 CONCERNING THE CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION DEGREE PLAN

Adequacy of Preparation in Developing an understanding Concerning:	1981-83 N	1981-83 Mean	1983-84 N	1983-84 Mean	1984-85 N	1984-85 Mean
-An Overview of the School Curriculum	1	3.00	3	4.00	5	3.00
-The Patterns of School Organization	1	3.00	3	3.33	5	2.80
-Instructional Elements of the Curricular Programs	1	3.00	3	4.00	5	3.20
-Educational Changes in School Curriculum	1	4.00	3	3.66	5	3.00
-The Administration and Supervision of Educational Programs	1	2.00	3	3.66	4	3.00
Adequacy of Preparation in Developing Skills In:						
-Curricular Innovations	1	3.00	3	3.66	5	3.20
-Instructional Evaluation	1	3.00	3	3.66	5	3.40
-Analyzing Issues Related to American Education	1	4.00	3	4.00	5	3.60
-Research Techniques	1	4.00	3	3.00	5	2.40

Scale:

5.00 = Exceedingly Adequate
4.00 = Very Adequate
3.00 = Adequate
2.00 = Inadequate
1.00 = Very Inadequate

TABLE XVI

A COMPARISON OF W.U. M.ED. GRADUATES' RATINGS OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS, ACCEPTABILITY, AND WEAKNESSES BY GRADUATES OF 1981-83, 1983-84, AND 1984-85 CONCERNING THE CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION DEGREE PLAN

Degree of Strength, Acceptability, and Weakness in:	1981-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
-Quality of Instruction	1	5.00	3	4.00	5	4.20
-Provisions for Advisement	1	5.00	3	3.66	5	4.00
-Thesis Requirement	1	5.00	3	3.66	4	3.25
-Student-Faculty Relationships	1	5.00	3	3.66	5	4.20
-Theoretical Foundations	1	4.00	3	4.00	4	4.00
-Acquaintance with the Various Roles of School Personnel	1	3.00	3	4.33	5	4.00
-Cognate Courses in Related Academic Disciplines Offered Outside the Department of Education	1	5.00	3	3.66	5	4.00

Scale:

5.00 = Strength
4.00 = Acceptable
3.00 = Weakness

TABLE XVII

A COMPARISON OF THE 1981-83, 1983-84, AND 1984-85 W.U. M.ED. GRADUATES' RATINGS OF THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE GRADUATE PREPARATION RECEIVED THROUGH THE CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION DEGREE PLAN

	1981-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Overall Quality of the Graduate Preparation Received at W.U.	1	4.00	3	4.00	5	3.00

Scale:

5.00 = Exceedingly Adequate
4.00 = Very Adequate
3.00 = Adequate
2.00 = Inadequate
1.00 = Very Inadequate

TABLE XVIII

A COMPARISON OF W.U. GRADUATES' RATINGS OF PROGRAM ACCEPTABILITY BY GRADUATES OF 1981-83, 1983-84, AND 1984-85 CONCERNING THE DEGREE PLAN IN ADMINISTRATION

Adequacy of Preparation in Developing an Understanding Concerning:	1981-83 N	1981-83 Mean	1983-84 N	1983-84 Mean	1984-85 N	1984-85 Mean
-Administrative Responsibilities in Areas of Organization, Supervision, and Management	7	2.71	2	4.00	23	3.70
-Successful Techniques for Effective Decision Making	7	2.86	2	3.50	23	3.30
-School Law	7	2.00	2	4.00	23	3.83
-Programs for Developing Positive Relations Between School and Community	7	2.57	2	2.50	23	3.26
Adequacy of Preparation in Developing Skills in:						
-Improving Instruction	7	2.57	2	4.00	23	3.30
-Dealing with Personnel Problems	7	2.71	2	3.00	23	3.35
-Effective Business Practices in School Administration	7	2.43	2	3.00	23	3.57
-Decision Making Concerning School Finance	7	2.14	2	3.00	23	3.52
-Research Techniques	7	2.57	2	3.00	23	3.00

Scale:

5.00 = Exceedingly Adequate
4.00 = Very Adequate
3.00 = Adequate
2.00 = Inadequate
1.00 = Very Inadequate

TABLE XIX

A COMPARISON OF W.U. M.ED. GRADUATES' RATINGS OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS, ACCEPTABILITY AND WEAKNESS BY GRADUATES OF 1981-83, 1983-84, AND 1984-85 CONCERNING THE DEGREE PLAN IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Degree of Strength, Acceptability, and Weakness in:	1981-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
-Quality of Instruction	7	3.71	2	4.00	23	4.13
-Provisions for Advisement	7	3.71	2	5.00	23	4.26
-Thesis Requirement	7	3.86	2	4.00	17	4.12
-Student-Faculty Relationships	7	3.86	2	4.50	23	4.70
-Theoretical Foundations	7	4.00	2	3.50	23	4.13
-Acquaintance with Roles of School Personnel	7	3.57	2	4.00	23	4.35

Scale:

5.00 = Strength
4.00 = Acceptable
3.00 = Weakness

TABLE XX

A COMPARISON OF THE 1981-83, 1983-84, AND 1984-85 W.U. M.ED. GRADUATES' RATINGS OF THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE GRADUATE PREPARATION RECEIVED THROUGH THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEGREE PLAN

	1981-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Overall Quality of the Graduate Preparation Received at W.U.	7	2.86	2	3.50	23	3.78

Scale:

5.00 = Exceedingly Adequate
4.00 = Very Adequate
3.00 = Adequate
2.00 = Inadequate